DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 673 **HE 011 485**

AUTHOR	Moen, Norman W.
TITLE	The History and Prospects of General College 1932-1982. General College Newsletter, Vol. XXV, No. 4.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General Coll.
PUB DATE	Jun 79
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Access to Education; College Planning; Curriculum Planning; Educational History; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Objectives; Faculty Development; *General Education; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Research; Instructional Innovation; *Liberal Arts; *Nontraditional Students; *Open Enrollment; Projects; *State Universities; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS	General College MN; *Institutional History; *University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

General College, an independent unit of the University of Minnesota, is described in this application for funds and associate status as a participant in Project IV of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. The college is an urban, open admissions school that focuses on the interdisciplinary and liberal arts component of the undergraduate curriculum. Various certificates, the associate of arts degree, and two baccalaureate degree programs are offered by the college. The importance of the open admissions policy in helping the college serve persons who are disadvantaged by traditional student practices or who would be excluded from higher education by conventional student selection/retention policies is discussed. Low tuition and utilitarian courses of study add a unique dimension to the program at General College. The history and future prospects of the college since 1932 are divided into three periods: formative years (1932-1942); war years (1942-1970); and the outreach years (1970-1980). The important characteristics and developments of each period are discussed. A four point proposal that would be implemented as part of General College's invclvement in Project IV includes: (1) restructuring of the General College program; (2) intensification of the research and testing program; (3) orientation of tenure-track faculty to general/liberal education; and (4) expansion of reports on general/liberal education at General College. Each aspect of the proposal is described and the role that General College can play in the support and development of general education programs is discussed. (BH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172673

GENERAL COLLEGE NEWSLETTER

Volume XXV, Number 4 June, 1979

THE HISTORY AND PROSPECTS OF GENERAL COLLEGE 1932-1982

Norman W. Moen

The faculty of the General College, an integral and independent unit of the University of Minnesota, has been involved in the interdisciplinary/general/liberal education component of the undergraduate curriculum since 1932. For almost fifty years, it has inventoried student interests and concerns periodically, experimented with innovative courses, tested new classroom procedures, and assessed outcomes. It now offers programs of varying duration which culminate in a range of certificates, the associate in arts degree, and two baccalaureate degrees. Its own faculty of about one hundred, half of whom are tenured or tenure-track professors, serves approximately 2,700 students.

In the pages which follow, we point to contributions we can make to the national discussion of liberal education contemplated in Project IV -- e.g., design, content, and evaluation of interdisciplinary lower-division and/or capstone courses; assessments of student characteristics, necessities, and achievements; and experiences with a free-choice curriculum culminating in comprehensive examinations for an associate in arts degree.

In exchange, from participation in Project IV we hope to gain counsel and access to models as we move into a four-point project for vitalizing our faculty and renovating our program. This project, explained more fully below, includes 1) restructuring our curriculum to reflect more efficiently the wide range of academic abilities characteristic of our student body; 2) intensifying current research on academic motivations of our entering students, student evaluations of our instruction, and our comprehensive examination; 3) familiarizing our able, new, tenure-track faculty with models of different approaches to general/liberal education found in various parts of the country; and 4) utilizing results of our recent and current research to improve both upper- and lower-division general/liberal education courses in General College. By employing our own publications as vehicles for exporting tested and evaluated curriculum packages, and by participation in Project IV, we may contribute to the improvement of general/liberal education in other institutions as well as in those on this campus and in this region.

This four-point project, the long history of the College's focus on general/liberal education, its studies and evaluations, its non-traditional students and the kinds of courses and programs worked out for them in light of its unique mission within the structure of the University of Minnesota -- all suggest that General College can broaden and enrich the deliberations of institutions associated in Project IV.

This Newsletter presents the text of an application submitted on behalf of General College for associate status in the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education Project IV: Examining the Varieties of Liberal Education. The fund is managed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ of Minn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE011485

Narrative of Proposal Submitted by General College, University of Minnesota

Mission of General College: The program which gives General College both its name and its distinctive quality derives its character from a policy of open admissions. The General College faculty believes that any person who is a high-school graduate (and some who are not) should have access to the University of Minnesota and the opportunity to advance in higher education as far as capabilities, performance, circumstances, and predilections allow. The University itself is an urban institution with a high proportion of commuters coming from an ethnically mixed metropolitan area. Following the principle of open admissions, then, means that the essential purpose of General College is to serve persons who are disadvantaged by traditional academic practices, or who would be excluded from higher education by conventional student selection/retention policies. General College student personnel services, courses, and programs are designed in light of the purposes of an extremely varied and highly non-traditional student body.

The presence of such students and such a college on the campus of one of the nation's large, research-oriented universities is an anomaly but not an accident. For, as a colleague, William L. Hathaway, points out, General College has roots in two democratizing ideas in American higher education.

The first is the idea of the land-grant college. Enacted in 1862, the Morrill Act granted federal lands to the states to finance tuition-free colleges and universities of a new kind. Minnesota's president, C. Peter Magrath, wrote in 1976 that these new institutions were "not just for the few, not just for the rich or well born . . . but for the many; for those who in the language of the 1800s were called the mechanics and industrial classes." For more than a century, land-grant colleges and universities -- Minnesota the largest among them -- have opened higher education to the masses of the American people (General College Newsletter, XXV:3, May, 1979, passim.).

The second democratizing idea, the pragmatic philosophy of William James and John Dewey, generated the concept of "instrumentalist general education." Dewey's philosophical and educational ideas suggested to the founders of General College a sharply different way of shaping the educational program offered to those whom higher education had neglected. The more conservative (or Platonist) view of knowledge invests ideas and abstractions with reality, and exposure to these becomes an end in itself. Particular modes of inquiry generate disciplines. Disciplines beget departments whose courses supply students with content which may or may not be important to them now or later. Seen in the light of Dewey's philosophy, on the other hand, curriculum becomes not an end, but a means; courses of study have instrumental and utilitarian, rather than intrinsic, good; instead of conforming to abstractions, programs are fashioned to meet pressing, current needs of those enrolled in them.

The combination of these two democratizing ideas determined the mission of General College and shaped its general/liberal education program. The fact that we are a unit in a complex university means that our students also have access to the widest possible variety of specialized studies.

The college now is becoming old enough to enable us to discern that its history falls into approximately three periods: Formative Years, 1932-1942; War Years, 1942-1970; and Outreach Years, 1970-1980. Our general/liberal education program shifted in some significant aspects as each period gave way to the next. Our students did too, except in one respect: almost all of them continue to rank in the lower fourth of high-school academic achievement scales, and most of them continue to be unable to meet admission requirements set by other units of the University.

Formative Years, 1932-1942: The first General College students finished high school during the hardships of the 1930s. Economic disaster led to depression and unemployment at home while world peace was threatened by belligerent dictatorships emerging abroad. Our students sought admission to the University in the hope of improving their chances in what promised to be a bleak and uncertain future. The two-year program first provided for them was based on the premise that they would lack time, means, and perhaps ability to complete baccalaureate degrees. Broad courses, such as biology from ovum to grave, introduced whole fields of knowledge. Faculty, borrowed from other departments, used non-traditional forms of instruction.

Soon, however, the college acquired a carefully developed and evaluated program of general education. Grants from the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation financed investigations of past and present students which came to be known internally as the adult and adolescent studies. A faculty of its own, advised by specially recruited curriculum consultants, devised a curriculum having its foundation in the findings of these two studies.

Eight interdisciplinary courses gave focus and coherence to general education in General College: Individual Orientation; Vocational Orientation; Home Life Orientation; Socio-Civic Orientation; General Arts; Literature, Speech, and Writing; Biological Sciences; and Physical Sciences. These courses focussed either upon studies useful to every American as an individual, a member of a family, a citizen, or a worker; or upon introductions to the essential workings of the basic fields of knowledge: science, social studies, and humanities. No credits were given; no specific grades were assigned. Except for the core courses, the curriculum was free-choice and almost completely without prerequisites or sequences. Each course was to be compact, one term in length, and as practical and applied as possible.

Good teaching was emphasized, with much use of laboratory or studio instruction and numerous audio-visual aids. The college maintained its own reading room with course-related materials on open shelves. Every teacher was an advisor. A special counseling office with a professional staff, the first on campus, was an integral part of the whole program. The associate in arts degree was awarded when a student succeeded in passing comprehensive examinations in five of the eight areas of study into which the curriculum was organized.

Accounts of all this activity were published in what have become four classics of research and evaluation in higher education:

C. Robert Pace, They Went to College: A Study of 951 Former University Students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1941.

Cornelia T. Williams, These We Teach: A Study of General College Students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

Ivol Spafford and others, Building a Curriculum for General Education: A Description of the General College Program. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

Ruth E. Eckert, Outcomes of General Education: An Appraisal of the General College Program. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

War Years, 1942-1970: After relative stagnation during World War II, enrollment in General College doubled, redoubled, and then doubled again after 1946. Most of the students who flocked to us then and during the next twenty years were veterans with educational benefits earned while serving in the second world war, the war in Korea, and the war in Viet Nam. Although older, more sophisticated, and relatively more affluent than their predecessors, these also were young people who, on the whole, had found academic work uncongenial, were uncertain about careers, or had transferred to General College after foundering in the College of Liberal Arts or the Institute of Technology.

Faculty, administration, and curriculum expanded in the face of mounting enrollments. The college had formerly been a single budgetary unit supervised by a dean; now a growing faculty needed to be organized into divisions reflecting federations of disciplines: Art, Music, Philosophy, Literature, Speech, and Writing; Science, Mathematics, and Business; Social and Behavioral Studies. This divisional, rather than departmental, organization facilitated interdisciplinary growth of the curriculum, keeping it general instead of increasingly specialized. Although the divisions maintained the basic general education program, numerous related courses were added, orientation courses were redefined, and core courses were no longer required. The eight comprehensive examinations gave way to a single, massive instrument in several forms, validated and serving as both pre-test and degree requirement. Hundreds and hundreds of students sat for the examinations

through three comuplsory four-hour Saturday-morning sessions. Ultimately, the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, purchased the behemoth.

Most of the students of this period wanted traditional majors and at least four-year degrees, not general education and an associate in arts degree. A great many of them succeeded in earning grades high enough to convince other colleges to admit them with advanced standing for their General College work. To facilitate such transfers, our courses acquired credits, our instructors began to award standard letter grades and our general education program was weighted analytically for the purpose of fitting it by bits and pieces into the liberal education credit-distribution requirements of the four-year colleges.

Many of the student-veterans were particularly hurried and pragmatic. If they were not looking for transfer to a traditional program, they sought some kind of occupational education. Accordingly, the faculty -- with many misgivings -- added occupational training to its general education program. Some of these applied courses of study -- such as airline hostess, library aide, or mortuary science -- were abandoned or transformed into independent units. Others -- such as dental assisting and marketing -- have become hardy perennials.

During the war years, some of the more innovative aspects of our program were reported, largely for the information of the state's junior colleges, in such locally produced publications as General College Newsletter (now in its 25th year), General College Studies (in its 15th year), and The General Education Sounding Board (discontinued in 1973, after ten volumes had been issued). The following publications about the college reached a somewhat broader readership:

Horace T. Morse, General Education in Transition: A Look Ahead. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951. (Report of a national conference held under General College auspices.)

Henry Borow, "Postwar Research in the General College." Chapter 7 in Ruth E. Eckert and Robert J. Keller, editors, A University Looks at Its Program: The Report of the Bureau of Institutional Research, 1942-1952. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Forrest J. Harris, "The Social Studies Program in the General College of the University of Minnesota." Chapter 11 in Lewis B. Mayhew, editor, Social Studies in General Education. Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1960.

Russell Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962 (pages 184-199).

In its continuing effort to maintain programs based upon findings of student surveys, college researchers in 1958 identified a random sample of 300 freshmen for long-term study. Interviewed at the beginning of their General College residence, members of the sample were queried at regular intervals through

subsequent years. The study, which was directed by G. Gordon Kingsley, is described by Frank T. Benson in "The General College Follow-Up Study," General Education Sounding Board, 3:2 (1966); and by William A. Stockdale in "The General College Five-Ten Year Study," General College Studies, 5:2 (1969). A related investigation of one element in the college population is reported by F. Faith Finnberg in the internal publication, Those Who Transfer (1960).

Outreach Years, 1970-1980: In common with dozens of institutions across the country in the late 1960s, the University of Minnesota reacted to agitation for civil rights, demonstrations against the Viet Nam war, and demands for social justice in America by seeking new ways to give effective attention to the educational needs of by-passed populations. New prospective students came to the admissions office in the train of programs named for individuals (such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.) or for a social objective (such as Lyndon Johnson's Great Society). Agencies to serve them proliferated: Upward Bound, Youth Community, New Careers, Project Newgate, University Without Walls, Experimental College. General College was intimately associated with all of these ventures.

And General College admitted the bulk of the new students. New, that is, to higher education, but not to us. Although these representatives of long-ignored elements in American society enlarge and enrich its social, economic, and ethnic mix, our student body today continues to consist largely of a poorly prepared, high-academic-risk population.

The college reached out to this population with two sets of ethnic courses and tutorials in reading, writing, and mathmatics. We opened a centrally located reading/writing skills center and we authorized degree credit for prior learning, work experience, internships, and work completed in vocational-technical institutes. Realizing that its emphasis upon command of subject matter made it a liberal arts distribution requirement in disguise, the faculty abandoned the massive comprehensive examination in favor of a more complex instrument which, in addition to testing areas of knowledge, also measures attainment of acceptable reading, writing, and computational skills. To supplement our Division of Student Personnel Services, we established a HELP Center (Help Education Low-income Persons), complete with social workers, financial-aid advisors, and legal counselors.

These have been years of still other kinds of outreach. General College courses became more accessible than ever before as the faculty moved into University extension. We taught in the evening and by correspondence, radio, and television. We experimented with combinations of campus and community classes. We sent instructors to such special groups as Minneapolis vocational school teachers,

St. Paul police, and St. Cloud prisoners. We offered class and counseling packages in the outlying communities of Hopkins and Rochester. We organized interdisciplinary, credit-heavy courses for both lower- and upper-division students around such themes as environmental problems, contemporary race relations, conflict resolution, and the search for a good life. Occupational education expanded in several directions: applied history, work with the elderly, recreation for special groups, human services generalist and paralegal programs.

Most important of all, dealings with the students of the '60s and '70s convinced us that they know and can state what they need to learn; that our special, non-traditional learners have the right to study beyond the two-year degree; and that individually planned baccalaureate degree programs ought to be available to them if traditional four-year programs prove inaccessible or inappropriate. In 1970, therefore, with the consent of the University Senate and the Board of Regents, we embarked upon a project called Extended Programs -- a range of opportunities for university education beyond the sophomore year. The project encompasses occupational or paraprofessional education culminating in certificates, general education to enhance vocational-technical training, and two four-year degrees: Bachelor of Applied Studies (B.A.S.) and Bachelor of General Studies (B.G.S.).

We have had a decade of experience with student-designed baccalaureate degrees. The years have been exhilarating, but demanding. We have encountered problems relating to admitting, orienting, and advising almost 2000 four-year students. We have granted approximately 900 of the new degrees. These experiences are codified in a policy statement, General College Baccalaureate Program Guidelines, adopted by the faculty in 1976. The following year, the faculty approved an experimental approach to group orientation, advising, graduation, and administration. Two local publications were prepared to implement the policies embodied in this approach: Norman W. Moen and Evelyn U. Hansen, Core Planning for General College Baccalaureate Degrees (1976); and Evelyn U. Hansen, Planning a General College Baccalaureate Degree Program: An Incremental Discussion and Study Guide (1977).

The faculty committee charged with directing our baccalaureate programs spent the 1977-78 academic year in research for the purpose of discovering student and faculty attitudes toward the new degrees; value of the degrees for employment, promotion, and admission to graduate or professional study; impact of individualized program advising upon faculty time; and related matters. Reports of this research, all of them the work of Evelyn Unes Hansen, and all issued during the 1978-79 academic year, are as follows:

"An Interior View: Faculty Perceptions of the Individualized Baccalaureate Degree Program of the General College, University of Minnesota." General College Studies, XV:1 (1978-1979).

"Advising Time Inventory: Consequences of the General College Individualized Baccalaureate Degree Program on Faculty Advising, Activities, and Academic Load." General College Studies, XV:2 (1978-1979).

"Study of Graduates from General College Individualized Baccalaureate Degree Programs." General College Studies, XV:3 (1978-1979).

Other and more general aspects of our work, at the outset and at the current point in this history of the outreach years, can be found in the following:

Norman W. Moen, "The Minnesota General College." Improving College and University Teaching, XVII:2:77-80 (Spring, 1969).

Arthur Levine, Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum: A Report for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978 (passim.).

Possible General College Contributions to Project IV: From our wealth of experience, we believe we can make a significant contribution to a national discussion of the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum with the following materials:

1) the history of our three comprehensive examinations;
2) a description of the dynamics of our individualized two-year- and four-year-degree structures;
3) examples of many different kinds of curriculum-related research, as found in Appendix A; and
4) models -- frequently accompanied by evaluations -- of several varieties of approaches to general/liberal education, such as those listed in Appendix B.

Confronting the 1980s: The 1980s could be a promising decade for General College. The current hiatus in enrollment peaks frees us from the immense chore of providing for too many students with too few faculty. A new dean is giving us fresh leadership and a streamlined administrative structure. Enlightened policies of the University's academic vice president, as well as conditions encountered in the job market by persons with advanced liberal arts degrees, now enable us to select instructors from among applicants with completed doctorates and to appoint them immediately at the rank of assistant professor on tenure track. More than a dozen such recruits now give full attention to our enterprise; its well-being can determine their own professional futures. And all of us, both long-standing and new members of the faculty, sense that we have only just embarked upon a whole series of promising, interesting ventures: education for older learners,

paraprofessional education, new counseling-advising delivery systems, capstone courses, social-science-based occupational education -- all evolving with reference to our special student population.

Although the path beckoning us into the 1980s leads us into interesting developments, it also is marked by some thorns. We need opportunities to study what we are doing, to learn from what others are doing, and to attack the problem of retention -- particularly retention of minority students. We must take time to orient our new faculty and to invigorate colleagues who are suffering from burnout or are resting on their laurels. We should dedicate ourselves to the principle that the presence of our college on the campus of a research university means that we have a special research responsibility: to design, evaluate, and export general/liberal education courses of different kinds for a variety of programs.

For the core of everything we do is general/liberal education. We are first of all a general/liberal education faculty. President Steven Muller of The Johns Hopkins University could have been speaking for us when he reiterated the centrality of liberal arts in an article for the New York Times of January 7, 1979. In that article, President Muller said:

> The difficulties of liberal-arts education stem more from inner disintegration than from the job market. The well-educated generalist will fare well on the job and in society. But poorly educated generalists present a problem, and may well give liberal-arts education a bad name.

"Poorly educated generalists"! We in General College call it virtue to reach out to new learners, to invite non-traditional students to undertake advanced education. But we would serve them badly if the general/liberal education component of the degrees we recommend that the University award them were inferior. We need to reflect upon this, and to reassess our experience within the perspective of the experiences of others.

Project IV Proposal: These fundamental concerns motivate us to apply for the assistance that associate status in Project IV would give us in four areas:

First: Re-Structuring the General College Program -- During the 1979-80 academic year, we hope to begin considering a proposal to reorganize our program as follows:

I. Matriculation: Basic Studies

Measuring educational capabilities
Compensatory education
Attainment of acceptable collegiate standards

II. Middle Years: Collegiate Studies

Exploring abilities and preferences
Completion of certificate programs
Attainment of the associate in arts degree
Application for admission to baccalaureate study
Transfer to another college of the University

III. Final Years: Baccalaureate Studies

Completion of core program
Preparation of senior report
Graduation: B.A.S. or B.G.S.

These categories take account of the extreme variation in attainment and potential that is characteristic of our student body. Each candidate for admission to the college would be assigned to the category of studies which test results indicate would be appropriate. Time spent in a category would vary according to performance; the categories are deliberately not labelled freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years.

To accompany this reordering, we need to 1) enlarge and consolidate our student personnel and counseling services; 2) refine our testing programs; 3) define acceptable standards for movement from one level to another; 4) codify existing practices in accrediting non-traditional learning; and 5) expand the occupational and paraprofessional aspect of our curriculum.

Project IV would give us the counsel of curriculum experts in higher education and the advice of persons who have had experience in this kind of program structure.

Second: Intensifying the General College Research and Testing Program -- We have had the services of a small, specialized, central research group attached to our dean's office since 1954. Working with the Division of Counseling and Student Development, this group currently is engaged in, or is about to undertake, investigations as follows:

Academic Motivations of General College Students: In the 1940s, our colleague, Professor Henry Borow, investigated non-cognitive factors in academic achievement, and produced a measurement scale whose copyright is now owned by Stanford University. At the outset of the fall quarter of 1978, we administered to our entering freshmen the Academic Motivations Inventory developed by Ross Moen in consultation with Professor Borow and University Measurement Services. We are studying results of this inventory, following the progress of these students quarter by quarter. Our immediate hope is to identify motivations which are most closely related to student retention and success. Our long-range purpose is to adjust our program to foster, build upon, and respond to positive academic motivations.

General College Student Evaluation of Courses and Instruction: We are now at the end of our second year of work on creating and validating flexible instruments which allow students to evaluate General College courses and instruction. The first step, completed in 1977-78 in the Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences, was construction of a core questionnaire containing elements applied in all classrooms, supplemented by queries added by individual faculty members or relevant only in specific courses. This kind of work is being carried forward in the other two teaching divisions during 1978-79. Our colleague, Thomas Brothen, will report progress to date at the Fifth Annual Conference on Improving College and University Teaching, to be held in London the first week of July, 1979. As soon as the program becomes all-college in scope, we can consider programmatic revisions in light of what the evaluations say to us.

The General College Comprehensive Examination: Recently we have been too preoccupied with other projects to give our comprehensive examination the attention its centrality in our structure requires. Some members of the faculty question the assumptions which give the comprehensive examination its current form. Others point out that it does not correspond as closely as it should to our present curriculum. Busy faculty look on the comprehensive as an onerous, supererogatory responsibility. Many lack the expertise that creating a valid new test requires. We would use help from Project IV to refurbish our comprehensive by enlarging our research group (seeking the aid of a test-writing consultant) and, where appropriate, to purchase professionally prepared examinations.

Third: General/Liberal Education Orientation of Tenure-Track Faculty -- As stated above, we now find ourselves able to recruit new faculty, with completed doctorates, at the initial rank of assistant professor. Although this is a new experience for us, in some respects our situation is unchanged: graduate study remains traditional, and our new professors are usually interested in general/liberal education without knowing much about its forms or its potential. We provide new-faculty orientation to our own college every year. We would like to extend this orientation by exposing our younger colleagues to other programs by means of site visits. Our purpose is two-fold: to deepen understanding and to reinforce commitment by association with persons who have made their careers in general/liberal education. The campuses we think would have the most to contribute to the General College of the University of Minnesota include these:

Meiklejohn College, University of Wisconsin: Madison
University of Wisconsin: Green Bay
University College: Michigan State University
Wayne State University
Hampshire College
Empire State College
College of Basic Studies: Boston University
Federal City University
Brigham Young University
Experimental College, University of California: Berkeley
University of California: Santa Cruz
Johnston College: University of Redlands

Fourth: Reports of General/Liberal Education Curriculum Experiments in General College -- We have already said that we have a group of research specialists attached to the dean's office for the purpose of giving professional assistance to both college and individual faculty investigations. We noted that we publish results of our research in our own General College Studies for limited circulation. In addition, our work in General College fairly often is the subject of M.A. and Ph. D. dissertations. In short, we have both the experience and the potential for producing useful, innovative, general/liberal education curriculum studies, starting with theoretical rationale and proceeding through design, bibliography, evaluation, and final report. Participation in Project IV would give us added purpose and a critical audience. It would enlarge our export field, so to speak, and it could be decisive in leading many of our promising tenure-track colleagues to make final commitments to our General College program.

A specific proposal budget, with accompanying narrative information, follows. First, however, we would like to address one final subject.

General/Liberal Education in a Complex University: Arthur Levine, senior fellow at the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, recently identified "Ten Myths of General Education" for readers of The Chronicle of Higher Education (February 13, 1979). He had this to say about the view that large institutions cannot develop general education programs as creative and coherent as those offered by small colleges:

> This observation is based on the size of large institutions, on the wide diversity in ability and background of their student bodies, on the unimaginative quality of general education at most large institutions, and on the political travails and red tape involved in trying new ideas. In fact, large institutions have been responsible for some of the most exciting general-education programs I know of, such as the General College at the University of Minnesota, the Experimental College at Berkeley, the Residential College at the University of Michigan, and the Meiklejohn College at the University of Wisconsin. Moreover, some exciting programs are being attempted today at large schools such as Boston University and Brigham Young University. Actually, large schools have a certain advantage. They can economically provide a variety of options to students.

We are not nostalgic about past achievements. Neither are we daunted by what we propose to do in the years immediately ahead. We hope to continue to engage in constructive self-assessments. We intend also to continue to find new populations to serve. No longer are we thinking and talking about education for American middle-class, 18-25-year-old, primarily male students. We want to tune our program to the requirements of higher education in a populist era, to a time when general emphasis upon the college degree makes going to college imperative

even for the poorly qualified. We think there is even some possibility that we could be helpful to persons planning changes in the educational systems of China, Egypt, Latin America -- from underdeveloped nations generally -- for we have long experience dealing with the kinds of students they need to encounter.

Above all, we want to ensure that strong liberal arts courses are an integral part of the program of studies followed by every one of our students. We have faith that the heritage of these courses will enrich and inform their postgraduate daily lives.

Participation in, and financial assistance from, Project IV would be wonderfully helpful, timely, and a real spur to wringing all we can from the opportunities the 1980s appear to offer us.

Appendix A: The General College Faculty Studies Its Program -- Examples of Reports

From General College Studies:

Thomas Brothen and Sander Latts, "Application of Social Comparison Theory to General College Individual Adjustment Classes" (XIV:1, 1978).

Peggy O'Hare, "The General College Paralegal Program: Status and Opinions of Some Graduates" (XII:2, 1976).

Patricia K. Davis and others, "Final Evaluation of GC 1366, Images of Women in Literature" (XII:3, 1976).

Visitation Team, American Bar Association, "The General College Legal Paraprofessional Program: An Evaluation" (XI:2, 1975).

Vernelle Kurak, "At Large: The General College Reading/Writing Skills Center and Its Satellites, 1974-1975" (XI:4, 1975).

Virginia M. Kivits, "Progress Report on GC 1402: Reading and Vocabulary Development" (X:1, 1973).

John H. O'Neill, "Toward a Second Generation: Report of the General College Course 'Problems of Contemporary Race Relations'" (VIII:1, 1972).

Bradford Clark Brayton, Jr., "Being and Relating: A Conceptual Framework for Experimental Instruction in Integrated Communication" (VII:1, 1971).

Virginia M. Kivits, "An Experiment in Teaching English Composition Using an Oral Laboratory Approach" (V:6, 1969).

Fred M. Amram and David L. Giese, "Identifying and Teaching Creativity" (I:1-2-3, 1963-1965).

From General Education Sounding Board:

J. Merle Harris, "An Approach to Geology in General Education" (II:1, 1962).

David L. Giese and William A. Stockdale, "The Comparative Effectiveness of a Programmed Learning and a Conventional Workbook Method of Teaching Linguistic Skills" (III:1, 1966).

Alex Kurak, "Developing a Junior College Reading Test" (IV:1, 1967).

Jerome E. Gates, "Mobile Reflected Light Images: Description of a Process for Stimulating Aesthetic and Creative Behavior in Students (IV:1, 1967).

David L. Giese, et al., "General College Multi-Media Science Laboratory" (VI:1, 1969).

Daniel L. Schafer, "The Afro-American Experience" (VII:1, 1970).

Alex Kurak, "Philosophy through Literature: An Itinerary" (VII:1, 1970).

Richard D. Byrne, "A Description of Learning Experiences in GC 1483, Music Laboratory: Materials of Music" (VIII:1, 1971).

Thomas O'Toole and Daniel Schafer, "A Prospectus for Innovation: General Education and Area Studies" (VIII:1, 1971).

Leslie King, "Some Psychological Characteristics of a Good Society" (VIII:1, 1971).

Allen B. Johnson, "The Environmental Problems Program: Planning and Development; Implementation; Results; Conclusions and Recommendations" (IX:1, 1972).

Dorothy M. Burrows, "'Once Upon a Time . . .' An Account of an Experimental Course in Literature for Children" (X:1, 1973).

Toyse Kyle and Elayne Shapiro, "A Report on GC 1468, Dynamics of Transracial Communication" (X:1, 1973).

David Foat, "Born in Crisis: The Human Services Generalist Program" (X:1, 1973).

Susan F. Knoblauch, "Mathematics Fundamentals: Self-Paced and Individualized" (X:1, 1973).

John Oldendorf, "Practical Politics: An Involvement Approach to Teaching Political Science" (X:1, 1973).

Appendix B: Examples of General College Approaches to General/Liberal Education

Interdisciplinary Core Courses

Individual Adjustment
World of Work
Home Life
General Arts
Socio-Civic Orientation

Integrated Thematic Courses

Science in Context: Human Uses of the Environment
Humanities in Modern Living
Philosophy through Literature
Environmental Problems
Conflict Resolution

Coordinated Studies

Contemporary Race Relations
Integrated Communication
Studies of Aging

Upper-Division Integrated or Sequence Courses

Evolution and the Modern Species
Science in Context: Food, Its Uses and Abuses
Nature and Its Impact on the Mind
Modern Physical Science: Energy Sources and Conversions
Toward a Good Life
Minnesota Studies

Occupational Education in a General Education Environment

Day Community
Legal Assistant
Human Services Generalist
Radiologic Technician
Marketing
Aging Studies
Dental Assistant